













2015 AUG 18 PM 4:48

DEPUTY CLERK

V.

2:05-CV-0235

Defendant.

The Court complied with plaintiff's request made in response to the August 26, 2005 Order to Respond by which plaintiff was instructed to inform the Court whether he wanted the second complaint form to be considered by the Court. Plaintiff was informed at that time that, if he wanted it receive consideration, it would be filed as a separate complaint.

Plaintiff's response was clear that he wanted both complaint forms filed and the claims asserted therein to be considered by the Court. Ten years after the fact, plaintiff is unhappy with his choice and its results and argues the Court made a mistake.

Plaintiff has presented no meritorious argument to support a grant of any relief whatsoever.

The "Motion to Object [etc.]" is DENIED.

SIGNED and ORDERED this 18th day of August, 2015.

  
CLINTON E. AVERITTE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE